

## REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1-16, 18-25, and 27-28 as set forth above. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,535,929 issued to Provino et al. (Provino). In particular, the Office asserts that Provino teaches a system and a method comprising a plurality of components (figure 1, 40, 42, 46, 34), a first component in the plurality of components having a universal contextual interface (see column 3 line 63 to column 4 line 4 and column 5 lines 23-34, wherein the universal communication comprising interface module 78), the universal contextual interface associated with at least one instruction for transferring contextual data (see column 5 lines 23-67, wherein instructions are REGISTER, DEREGISTER, SEND, RECEIVE etc.), and a second component in the plurality of components that invokes the universal contextual interface to execute the at least one instruction to transfer the contextual data between the first component and at least one of the plurality of components (see column 5 lines 23-67, wherein other components such as 42, 46, etc. invokes universal communication and instructions such as REGISTER etc. for transfer to other components such as 42, 46, 34), the plurality of components having no prior knowledge of each other (see abstract, wherein the components such as 40, 42, 46, 34 allow two applications of dissimilar addressing mode to communicate with one another without a prior knowledge of each other).

Provino does not teach a system comprising “a plurality of devices, a first device in the plurality of devices having a universal contextual interface, the universal contextual interface associated with at least one instruction for transferring contextual data, and a second device in the plurality of devices that invokes the universal contextual interface of the first device to execute the at least one instruction to transfer the contextual data between the first device and at least one of the other devices in the plurality of devices, the plurality of devices having no prior knowledge of each other” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Provino does not teach a method for providing context information, the method comprising “invoking a universal contextual interface associated with a first device in a plurality of devices, the contextual interface associated with at least one instruction for transferring contextual data, and executing the at least one instruction to transfer the

contextual data between the first device and a second device in the plurality of devices, the plurality of devices having no prior knowledge of each other” as recite in claim 11.

Moreover, Provino does not teach a computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions for providing context information, which when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform “invoking a universal contextual interface associated with a first device in a plurality of devices, the contextual interface associated with at least one instruction for transferring contextual data, and executing the at least one instruction to transfer the contextual data between the first device in and a second device in the plurality of devices, the plurality of devices having no prior knowledge of each other” as recited in claim 20.

To the contrary, Provino teaches a universal communication mechanism that permits information to be passed between computer-implemented applications employing different memory addressing modes within an operating system environment, such as Windows. (Col. 3, lines 49-56). The universal communication mechanism is implemented as a virtual device driver, which may be accessed by application programs running in the operating system environment to utilize its universal communication mechanism services, and permits communication between applications within an operating system environment, when those applications employ different memory addressing modes. (Col. 4, lines 1-13). In addition, Provino states that the purpose of the universal communication mechanism is to solve “communications problems between dissimilar applications running in an operating system environment.” (Col. 9, lines 43-46). Provino does not teach that the universal communication mechanism can facilitate the transfer of contextual data between two devices having no prior knowledge of each other, as is required by the amended claims.

Thus, Provino does not teach each and every element of independent claims 1, 11, and 20. Accordingly, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 11, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Since claims 2-10 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 12-19 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 11, and claims 21-28 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 20, they are distinguishable over the cited reference and patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 11, and 20.

In view of all of the foregoing, applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Marc S. Kaufman, Reg. No. 35,212 c/o  
Gunnar G. Leinberg, Reg. No. 35,584

Date: March 1, 2005

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
CLINTON SQUARE  
PO Box 31051  
Rochester, NY 14603  
Phone: (585) 263-1000  
Fax: (585) 263-1600